



ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT AND SEAWALL PROJECT

COMMENT SUMMARY

February – May 2003

Introduction

The Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project database contains 3,453 comments, 72 of which were submitted between February and April 2003.

Origin of Comments

59 of the comments received came from attendees at community briefings held by the project team. Eight more comments came through email, and five were submitted through the project website.

38 comments were received from the central section of the project area, 22 from the north region, and two from the southern section. Four comments came from outside the project area. The origin of the other six comments could not be determined.

Design Issues

The project comment form and the online website both feature a section where commenters can rate 22 design issues on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating a low level of concern and 5 indicating the highest level. As most of the comments received during the comment period were communicated at community briefings, there is not enough data available on these design issues to analyze.

Comment Categories

The four categories which received the most commentary between February and April were:

Cost 16

Is there a ball park cost on just
redoing the seawall?

A pure tunnel solution is unaffordable.
A totally elevated structure would be
aesthetically horrendous, and still
unaffordable. The surface ("boulevard")
option is cheapest, but has several
disadvantages.



Land Use and Zoning13

In regards to the new waterfront park by the aquarium, the waterfront does need a good door, but the emphasis is on the waterside and it seems there could be some good development in addition to the park.

Parking is very important.

Connections/Circulation10

Has the project considered a tunnel for through traffic and surface boulevard for city traffic?

What about ramps at Mercer and Roy? It seems those are more disruptive than what we have now.

How many lanes of surface are there with the tunnel-lite option?

Traffic9

By widening Mercer you will just be increasing the parking lot that it currently is and nothing is happening to I-5.

Connecting two major state highways (Hwy 99 & SR-520)--as well as I-5-- would greatly enhance the flow of traffic in the area. It would also provide a route from I-5/SR-520 to the Seattle waterfront, avoiding Seattle streets with multiple traffic lights.

If the Viaduct were to come down, what transportation alternatives would we have?